DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's argues neither Herz or Miller disclose "content elements, each

content element comprising a plurality of types of representations having different media

characterics"

Examiner respectfully disagrees, Herz discloses "a user-customized rank

ordered listing of target objects most likely to be of interest

to each user so that the user can select from among these

potentially relevant target objects, which were automatically

selected by this system from the plethora of target objects that

are profiled on the electronic media", (Col. 1 lines 15-42)

wherein the different media characteristics are associated with

the target objects also disclosed by Herz wherein news

categories (i.e. content elements) and the users actively e

article have different visual and metadata information (Col. 3

lines 10-32)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 13-17 and 25-28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Herz et al (US Patent 6029195 hereinafter "Herz") in view of Miller et

al (US Patent 5,799,304 hereinafter "Miller")

Regarding claim 1,Herz discloses a method for dynamically creating and delivering

interactive personalized content in an electronic environment "customized electronic

identification of desirable objects, such as news articles, in an electronic media

environment, and in particular to a system that automatically constructs both a "target

profile" for each target object in the electronic media based, for example, on the

frequency with which each word appears in an article relative to its overall frequency of

use in all articles, as well as a "target profile interest summary" for each user, which

target profile interest summary describes the user's interest level in various types of

target objects", Abstract

automatically sequencing and editing the context elements within the narrative

framework in the first agent (Col. 2 lines 8-26, software agent, Col. 27 lines 36-40)

based upon a profile of a user, to create a dynamically generated narrative (Col. 6 lines

1-15, Abstract)

Herz does not explicitly disclose providing a first agent with a **narrative

framework which represents a story**, automatically modifying the dynamically

generated narrative in a second agent based upon a particular delivery context of the

plurality of delivery contexts to create **a modified story,** wherein the particular delivery

context is associated with the second agent, or disclose rendering the modified story in

the second agent in the particular delivery context for the presentation to the user.

However Herz does provide content elements, each content element comprising a

plurality of types of representations having different media characteristics (i.e. various

types of target objects, Abstract, in an electronic media environment, such as news

articles Col. 1 lines 17-41) (i.e. which appear to be a story but does not specifically state

the term) and each content elements being modifiable to be rendered for a plurality of

delivery context (Col. 2 lines 5-10, Col. 2 lines 38-67) and "a network-based agent that

seeks out users of a network with common interests and dynamically creating bulletin

boards"(Col. 80 lines 42-45, "Customization of the information delivery process to the

user's 10 unique tastes and interests, Col. 2 lines 5-17); and "dynamically creating

bulletin boards" (Claim 6,, network based agent, Claim 10).

        Miller discloses "information which scans information, determines " agents" who

match the information, generates values indicating the relevance of portions of that

information to a user, and, based upon the values determined, presents portions of the

information which is most relevant to a user", (Col. 1 lines 5-15), Note, Miller disclose

first and second agent in Fig. 4, Fig. 9 , Fig. 10a and Fig. 15 and "determining of

evaluation values for portions of the information includes allowing agents representing

the user-relevant features to vote on the portions of the information. It further may

include subtracting votes from the votes for each of the portions of the information to

determine a difference, and dividing the difference by a number of the votes for each of

the portions and against each of the portions of the information. Agents otherwise voting

against an article may reverse polarity, that is, voting for the article if one of the user-relevant features occurs in the information more than an average number of times. The voting may also include allowing voting for certain of the agents which are statistically reliable. In this way, information processing itself may be made more reliable, because those agents which have not performed well in previous sessions can be prevented from voting in a current session", (feedback between agents", Col. 2 lines 20-51). Miller also discloses "allow the mapping of given identified features to given agents. In short, the surrogate contains mappings of indices mapping articles to features, features to agents, and agents to articles. This short-term memory, or surrogate, is maintained for the duration of the session, and portions of it may be stored (such as the agent information), in the user profile for additional processing. The evaluator 850 references the surrogate class 800 and the agent objects themselves 840. The story list viewer 860 references the evaluator class 850 (i.e. a narrative framework which represents a story) to control the evaluation and learning process, and also references the surrogate class 800 for referencing eValues and recording user feedback. The story viewer 870 may be used by the story list viewer itself in order to display given stories from the story list", (a narrative framework which represents a story/story list) (Col. 7 lines 34-49)and "sorting and/or filtering of articles to the user in a story viewer or a story list viewer application program", i.e. (the modified story), (Col. 8 lines 61, 62), and Miller discloses rendering the modified story in the second agent in the particular delivery context for the presentation to the user"control the re-transmission of articles via electronic mail, fax, or other communications mechanism, either to the user or other destination (such as a

second user). This application is particularly useful for remote access, group knowledge sharing, or urgent alerts via a remote pager" (Col. 9 lines 1-5, Fig. 1-4).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the media source-storyline, user profile, feedback, evaluation system as taught by Miller with the user profile article customization of Herz to effectively and efficiently provide an interactive personalized presentation of a story.

Claim 13 is similar in scope to claim 1 therefore the claim is rejected under similar rationale.

Regarding claim 2, Herz discloses further comprising updating the user profile based on a user interaction history "target profile interest summary describes the user's interest", "the system then evaluates the target profiles against the users' target profile interest summaries to generate a user-customized rank ordered listing of target objects most likely to be of interest to each user so that the user can select from among these potentially relevant target objects, which were automatically selected by this system from the plethora of target objects that are profiled " Abstract

Claims 14 and 26 are similar in scope to claim 2 therefore the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

Regarding claim 3, Herz discloses in which the user profile is created by gathering data from the user, analyzing a history of the user, monitoring data related to the user, and detecting patterns and trends of the user a profile for the target object and the profiles of target objects for which the user (or a similar user) has provided positive feedback in the past (Col. 6 lines 40-43, profile, Col. 3 lines 1-10, 1103/1108, Fig. 10).

Claims 15 and 27 are similar in scope to claim 3 therefore the claims are rejected under
similar rationale.

Regarding claim 4, Herz discloses in which the delivery context comprises a display
area ("automatic display on the users screen" Col. 68 lines 15-21)

Claims 16 and 28 are similar in scope to claim 4 therefore the claims are rejected under
similar rationale.

Regarding claim 5, Herz discloses in which the delivery context comprises a network
(Abstract, Fig. 1, Fig. 2)

Claim 17 is similar in scope to claim 5 therefore the claim is rejected under similar
rationale.

Regarding claim 25, Herz discloses a method comprising: creating a dynamically
generated narrative framework in the first agent by:

automatically changing the sequence of the content elements within the narrative
framework based upon a profile of a user automatically editing the content elements
based upon the profile; "customized electronic identification of desirable objects, such
as news articles, in an electronic media environment, and in particular to a system that
automatically constructs both a "target profile" for each target object in the electronic
media based, for example, on the frequency with which each word appears in an article
relative to its overall frequency of use in all articles, as well as a "target profile interest
summary" for each user, which target profile interest summary describes the user's
interest level in various types of target objects", Abstract

Herz does not explicitly disclose representing **a story** as a narrative framework in a first
agent.

However Miller discloses representing a story as a narrative framework in a first
agent, the narrative framework comprising content elements of different media types
(Fig. 4, 840/Agent, Story Viewer/870, Story List Viewer/860, Fig. 8), creating a modified
story in a second agent by automatically modifying the dynamically generated narrative
based upon a delivery context that is associated with the second agent "receiving
feedback which modifies how future articles should be evaluated", Abstract, Claim 2,
"the display of information, such as an article, wherein the user may provide feedback
regarding the interest in that article", Fig. 12
rendering the modified story in the second agent in the delivery context for presentation
to the user""information which scans information, determines " agents" who match the
information, generates values indicating the relevance of portions of that information to
a user, and, based upon the values determined, presents portions of the information
which is most relevant to a user", (Col. 1 lines 5-15, Fig. 12), Note, Miller disclose first
and second agent in Fig. 4, Fig. 9 , Fig. 10a and Fig. 15

Furthermore Miller discloses "determining of evaluation values for portions of the
information includes allowing agents representing the user-relevant features to vote on
the portions of the information. It further may include subtracting votes from the votes
for each of the portions of the information to determine a difference, and dividing the
difference by a number of the votes for each of the portions and against each of the
portions of the information. Agents otherwise voting against an article may reverse

polarity, that is, voting for the article if one of the user-relevant features occurs in the

information more than an average number of times. The voting may also include

allowing voting for certain of the agents which are statistically reliable. In this way,

information processing itself may be made more reliable, because those agents which

have not performed well in previous sessions can be prevented from voting in a current

session", (feedback between agents", Col. 2 lines 20-51).

Miller also discloses "allow the mapping of given identified features to given

agents. In short, the surrogate contains mappings of indices mapping articles to

features, features to agents, and agents to articles. This short-term memory, or

surrogate, is maintained for the duration of the session, and portions of it may be stored

(such as the agent information), in the user profile for additional processing. The

evaluator 850 references the surrogate class 800 and the agent objects themselves

840. The story list viewer 860 references the evaluator class 850 (i.e. a narrative

framework which represents a story) to control the evaluation and learning process, and

also references the surrogate class 800 for referencing eValues and recording user

feedback. The story viewer 870 may be used by the story list viewer itself in order to

display given stories from the story list", (a narrative framework which represents a

story/story list) (Col. 7 lines 34-49)and "sorting and/or filtering of articles to the user in a

story viewer or a story list viewer application program", (Col. 8 lines 61, 62, Fig. 12), and

Miller discloses rendering the modified story in the second agent in the particular

delivery context for the presentation to the user"control the re-transmission of articles

via electronic mail, fax, or other communications mechanism, either to the user or other

destination (such as a second user). This application is particularly useful for remote

access, group knowledge sharing, or urgent alerts via a remote pager" (Col. 9 lines 1-5,

Fig. 1-4)"

Miller discloses content elements of different media types (100, Fig. 4) and

automatically changing the sequence (i.e. filtering) of the content elements within the

narrative framework based upon a profile of a user" (160, user profile Fig. 4)

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to

combine the media source-storyline, user profile, feedback, evaluation system as taught

by Miller with the user profile article customization of Herz to effectively and efficiently

provide an interactive personalized presentation of a story.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BRANDON PARKER whose telephone number is (571)270-1302. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 730- 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dennis Chow can be reached on 571-272-7767. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/DENNIS-DOON CHOW/   Brandon Parker
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2174   Examiner
                                             Art Unit 2174